DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 755 HE 029 355

AUTHOR Kelley, John M.; Fenner, Gary B.
TITLE Using Campus Climate Results To Improve Institutional Quality. AIR 1996 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 96
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (36th, Albuquerque, NM, May 5-8, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; College Faculty; Decision Making; Higher Education; *Institutional Research; *Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; Quality of Working Life; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Surveys; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; *Villanova University PA

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes a recent organizational climate survey conducted at Villanova University (Pennsylvania). The campus-wide project distributed questionnaires to all faculty and staff, both full-time and part-time (N=1800) and a 39 percent response rate was achieved. The survey measured perceptions of the following core processes and values: leadership, communication, collegial decision making, trust and respect, satisfaction, recognition, and sense of community. The origin of the survey as well as its technical development and dissemination are discussed. Several issues arising from various stakeholder perspectives are addressed including anonymity of responses, multiple survey versions versus a single version, and identification of organizational units. Special attention is paid to the use of survey results in making specific improvements and enhancing the University's operations. A case example of how survey results are being used to improve the financial affairs unit is outlined. The survey is attached. (DB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 397 755



# Using Campus Climate Results to Improve Institutional Quality

A Paper Presented at the
Thirty-Sixth Annual Forum

The Association for Institutional Research

Presented by:

John M. Kelley, Executive Director
Planning and Institutional Research
Villanova University
800 Lancaster Avenue
Villanova, Pennsylvania 19085-1699
610-519-4835

Gary B. Fenner, Vice-President
Financial Affairs
Villanova University
800 Lancaster Avenue
Villanova, Pennsylvania 19085-1699
610-519-4532

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE029 3555

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

## ABSTRACT

*This paper summarizes a recent organizational climate survey conducted at Villanova University. The campus-wide project distributed questionnaires to all faculty and staff, both full-time and part-time. The survey measured perceptions of the following core processes and values: leadership, communication, collegial decision making, trust and respect, satisfaction, recognition, and sense of community. The origin of the survey as well as its technical development and dissemination are discussed.. Several issues arising from various stakeholder perspectives are addressed. Special attention is paid to the use of survey results in making specific improvements and enhancing the University's modus operandi. In addition, the recent literature on climate surveys within higher education is reviewed.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning*

This paper was presented at the Thirty-Sixth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, May 5-8, 1996. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Editor
AIR Forum Publications

The phrase, "climate survey", is one of those elusive social science terms that has a nebulous, but erudite resonance. Coined in the 1950s, a "climate survey" is a special breed of survey research which seeks to take an organization's pulse...gauge a corporate culture. Typically climate surveys attend to underlying values and processes such as integrity, openness and communication. Climate surveys can be traced to the Human Relations School of organizational theory whose proponents beginning in the late 1940s (e.g. Douglas McGregor, Rensis Likert, Chris Argyris) advanced individual traits such as self-actualization, self-worth, individual responsibility and creativity as correlates of productivity (Khandwalla, 1977; Morgan, 1986). The values underlying some of the continuous quality paradigms in higher education espouse similar constructs: teamwork, fear reduction, leadership (Cornesky et al, 1991; Seymour 1992). Climate surveys typically focus upon a finite number of organizational traits and processes and operationalize them (similar to most psychometric models) by means of individual survey items which are behaviorally anchored. Thus, one behavioral dimension of effective communication may be: *"My supervisor effectively communicates the University's mission to me."*

Climate surveys are customary in the private sector, but not nearly as common in academe. In early 1995, a Villanova survey of over 200 colleges and universities found that only one reported conducting a similar project. Several institutional research colleagues mentioned to the authors that climate surveys were more popular in the 1970s and early 1980s, and our research does not refute this. A review of the literature since 1992 reveals a pronounced upswing in student satisfaction surveys, often directly emanating from an institution's quality improvement program. However, climate surveys of faculty and staff are rare and many focus upon one or two attributes such as diversity and gender. Of the few climate surveys that the search identified, none reported

innovative procedures or particular emphasis upon research utilization, a main theme of the Villanova study. Response rates for full time faculty and staff ranged from 31.8 percent (Mattice, forthcoming), 54 percent (Mohammadi et al, 1995) which places the Villanova study's 45 percent return rate in the upper middle portion of the distribution.

## Synopsis

In December 1994, each member of the Villanova employee community - faculty and staff, full-time and part-time - was invited to complete and submit an anonymous "Campus Climate Survey."[1]

The survey was a groundbreaking effort from two perspectives. First, such a project, which listened to the voices of all our colleagues, was unprecedented at Villanova University. Second, such an encompassing collection of faculty and staff input is uncommon in academe.

The Climate Survey was driven by the mission of our continuous quality improvement program, Villanova Quality Improvement(VQI), which seeks to "deepen our communal bond." The content areas of the survey were suggested by the results of an earlier 1993 qualitative study conducted by members of our quality improvement Steering Committee wherein 102 colleagues were interviewed and findings pointed up the need to improve communication, decision making, leadership, trust, and recognition. To better calibrate the qualitative findings, it was judged that "harder" numeric data were needed. Hence the development of the survey.

## Survey Development

The development of the 114 item survey instrument took exactly one year. The Office of

---

[1] The survey sought to measure perceptions regarding the following critical processes and values: communication, collegial decision making, leadership, trust and respect, satisfaction, recognition, and sense of community.

Planning and Institutional Research (OPIR) provided technical support to a team consisting of five members of the VQI Senior Leadership Committee. Developing item content was a fairly straightforward task. After a review of the literature and scrutiny of over a dozen published and unpublished instruments, 207 potential survey items were submitted to the team which consisted of two Vice Presidents, one Assistant Dean, one faculty member and one human resource administrator. The team winnowed the item array, adding and rephrasing items as needed. A draft of items in the Spring of 1994 was submitted to the full VQI Senior Leadership Committee for review and comment. This was the first step in a back and forth review process between the work team and the committee which produced five subsequent draft instruments, each a refinement of the prior version.

More problematic than item content was the development of classifying variables. Constructing clear, accurate taxonomies of job classifications and organizational departments, although sounding like easy tasks, were indeed difficult, especially insuring that categories did not overlap.

It should also be noted that the final version of the draft instrument was field tested with eight persons in selected departments to check for reading level, ambiguity and completion time. Based on feedback from this assessment, several refinements were made.

## Issues Addressed

**Anonymity** was obviously a deep concern. Incorporating traditional bio-demographic variables (e.g.,ethnicity, gender, age) as survey items would have made it possible to identify certain individuals. Thus, very few classifying variables were included and in the case of the item, "length of time employed at the University", grouped response categories (e.g., "less than five

years, 5-10 years, more than 10 years") were used to mask respondents' identities.

**Multiple Versions versus Single Version** gave rise to an interesting yet unanticipated debate. It was recognized that the faculty and staff populations differ in certain ways. For example the term, "supervisor" is not used in the academic sector and one could argue that the job functions of a "department chairperson" do not match those of the classical "supervisor". Thus, a number of senior leaders leaned toward at least two versions of the instrument, one for staff and one for faculty. All agreed that this parallel form approach would solve many of the linguistic problems inherent in the single form approach. In the end, however, the Senior Leadership Committee chose to issue a single survey form, not due to psychometric advantages, but to the hidden message that might be sent. Specifically, issuing separate faculty and staff instruments reinforces differences in job functions, and, according to several members could be interpreted as favoring one group over the other: "Why didn't **they** get the same form **we** did?" Given our anchoring Villanova Quality Improvement in the principle of community, it was felt that a single instrument would best support this ideal.

**Identifying Organizational Units** proved to be a very sensitive area. The issue here is: "How specific should the survey be in identifying the organizational unit under study?" For example, the Financial Affairs Unit is composed of no fewer than nine subunits: Accounts Payable, Bursar, Controller, Graphic Services, Human Resources, Mail Services, Office of the Vice President, Payroll, Purchasing. From the perspective of making specific improvements, the VQI Senior Leadership Committee concurred that being able to tie data to the most specific organizational unit was superior since such unit-specific data could be used to improve that particular unit; if the data were aggregated, insights about individual organizational units would be lost in the data merger.

For example, should the respondent identify that he/she is a member of the more generic Financial Affairs Unit or the subunit, Accounts Payable? Should the respondent note her/his college or the academic department within the college? From a data utility or formative evaluation perspective, the more specific the subunit, the better. There is an old saw in evaluation research that claims: "You can always aggregate up, but not the other way around." Yet, to be identified could conceivably place those departments in a vulnerable position if the related survey results were not positive. After considerable dialogue and debate, the Senior Leadership Committee opted for the more generic level. The classifying variable became the college or major administrative unit (see Item 5 of the attached survey). This decision was a conscious trade-off. Decision makers believed that, especially for a first time effort like this one, concern and anxiety would exist about how the findings might be used. It was judged that omitting specific department affiliations would lessen anxiety, build trust and foster a respectable response rate.

## Gaining Internal Support

The Climate Survey emanated from the campus-wide Villanova Quality Improvement program. It had a single, overriding purpose: "To help us [Villanova] in our efforts of continuous improvement." In this context, the Climate Survey sought data that would assist Villanova to better understand its organizational culture in order to build upon strengths and address areas needing improvement. The VQI Senior Leadership Committee, a team of sixteen top level academic and non-academic decision makers, spearheaded the Climate Survey. In order to inform and gain the support of key decision makers who did not sit on the VQI Senior Leadership Committee, a representative from the Senior Leadership Committee personally visited selected groups. The survey and cover letter were sent to members of these selected groups ahead of their

meetings. They were asked to closely review the survey materials and, at the meetings, share reactions, discuss issues and raise questions. These meetings were held in August 1994 with three groups: the Vice Presidents' Council, the Council of Deans and the VQI Steering Committee. The discussions were serious and informative, leading to endorsement of the survey and several final refinements.

## Survey Dissemination and Collection

On November 17, 1994, a letter was sent from the VQI Senior Leadership members to all colleagues, informing them of the purpose, content areas and anonymity of the upcoming survey and asking for their support by completing the instrument when they received it. The survey itself, complete with cover letter and return envelope, was mailed through the University mail system in early December. Several reminders to return the survey to the Office of Planning and Institutional Research were sent via the University E-mail system. VQI committee and team members also urged their colleagues to complete the survey.

Over 1800 surveys were distributed in early December and a response rate of 39 percent was achieved. This rate approaches 45 percent among full-time employees.

## Analysis

All analyses, report preparation and report distribution were performed by the Villanova Office of Planning and Institutional Research. Each function and product were carefully planned and reviewed by the Senior Leadership Committee. Descriptive statistics were used exclusively because of their relatively easy understandability. Two series of analyses were performed and displayed in reports. First, the scores of all items for each content area (e.g., communication, collegial decision making, leadership) were tabulated and a composite score produced for each

area. Second, item by item analyses were displayed. Frequencies and percentages were shared in table format for all response categories. A mean or average score was also computed for each individual item, and included in each table. In addition, break downs for each content area and item were separately calculated and displayed for the following categories: gender (male/female); employment status (full-time/part-time); length of employment (less than 5 years/5 to 10 years/more than 10 years); and, primary job function (administrator/academic administrator or department chair/faculty/office support staff/professional staff/maintenance or service staff).

## Report Construction and Circulation

An executive summary, which merged all responses, was distributed to the entire community in early April 1995. In addition, also in early April, full reports of the aggregated data were distributed to all Vice Presidents, Deans and Directors and, perhaps more importantly, made available to the entire community by placing reports on reserve in all libraries and with 78 VQI participants in all academic and administrative office areas in 29 different buildings. In this way, all Villanovans had direct access to the findings, both the summarized results and the item by item breakouts.

In addition to the aggregated data report, distinct reports were prepared for each of the sixteen academic and administrative areas identified in Item 5 of the attached survey. Thus, a customized report was prepared, using the same table layouts as the aggregate report for each individual college (e.g., Arts & Sciences, Engineering, etc.) and each major administrative area (e.g., Dining Services, Facilities Management, Financial Affairs, etc.). These reports were all shared with the President. In addition the Academic Vice President received a full set of customized reports germane to the academic areas. The appropriate report was also sent to the



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

respective head of each college and major administrative unit. Thus, the Dean of Nursing received a customized report limited to data from respondents within the College of Nursing. The Vice President for Financial Affairs received a similar report consisting of data exclusively reported by employees in the Financial Affairs Unit. However, no Dean, Vice President or Director received data from any area other than their own. Further, it was left to the individual Dean, Vice President and Director to decide whether or not, and with whom, to share the unit-specific data.

## Research Utilization

This topic is perhaps the most innovative dimension of this paper. A number of Climate Surveys have been conducted in various higher educational institutions, but we are aware of none that took the following approach to understanding and utilizing the findings for continuous improvement. The Villanova approach design directly involved the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs in using the data to initiate action-oriented enhancements. The Academic Vice President personally met with and reviewed the results of the Climate Study individually with each of the College Deans and the head of the library. The President did likewise with the heads of each non-academic unit (again the reader is referred to Item 5 of the attached survey instrument for a list of these offices). Unit specific results were analyzed and compared with University-wide findings found in the aggregate report to identify strengths and areas that might be enhanced.

As a result, in many instances, the Deans, Vice Presidents and Directors took "data driven" action. Some requested more sophisticated analyses to further investigate selected issues. Others collected additional information from their faculty and/or staff to better illuminate topics of interest and concern. As anticipated, the level of effort varied, but in many cases it exceeded expectations.

## A Case Example - Financial Affairs Unit

The Climate Survey results and discussions with the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs sparked extensive work in many units. Several smaller units used workshop settings to share, review and analyze the data. Other larger units used standing VQI process improvement teams or specially recruited teams to scrutinize their Climate Study results. Tools such as Nominal Group Technique and Multiple Voting, which are taught in VQI training sessions, were often applied to order and prioritize needs and actions. One example of this process for transforming "information" to "judgment" to "action" is exemplified by the work of the Financial Affairs Unit. The way in which this Unit responded to the Climate Survey is described in the following series of steps:

- April 1995 — University disseminates executive summary and aggregate results of Campus Climate Survey to the entire community and individual area results to the responsible administrator in each major academic and administrative area.

- June 1995 — Financial Affairs Unit convenes community forum for all staff. Vice President for Financial Affairs (who is also member of VQI Senior Leadership Committee) presents overview of Campus Climate Survey and distributes statistical summary of item responses which compares "University Mean" on each item with Financial Affairs Mean on same items. [2]

  Responses wherein the Financial Affairs Unit mean substantially exceeded the University mean were highlighted. Conversely, ten responses were spotlighted wherein the Unit scored considerably below the University mean.

  Teams were recruited at the forum to address the five most negative variance areas.

---

[2] The average is a straightforward computation of the mean responses on a six point ordinal, semantic differential scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". Confer the attached instrument.

- Summer 1995 The five improvement teams convene over the summer, gather data as needed and, using quality problem-solving tools (e.g., Pareto Charts, Brainstorming, Benchmarking), develop a list of action steps to address each of the five study areas.

- September 1995 General meeting is held wherein the leaders of each of the five teams discuss their processes, findings and recommendations with the Vice President for Financial Affairs and the leader of the Financial Affairs process improvement team.[3]

  After considerable discussion, the group agrees that the then current organizational transformation goals of the Financial Affairs Unit should be reviewed in the context of the work of the five teams, and revised accordingly.

- Fall 1995 Revised Financial Affairs organizational transformation goals are reviewed and approved by the Financial Affairs management group.

The revised organizational transformation goals are described below:

1. To create a climate within Financial Affairs which is characterized by a highly motivated and quality service oriented work force in which individuals and teams feel that their contributions are valued, there are opportunities for personal and professional growth, and exceptional efforts are recognized and rewarded.

2. To enhance communication within and among all departments in Financial Affairs to ensure that people are kept up to date on what is happening and have the information they need to effectively do their jobs.

3. To improve the quality and efficiency of service through the identification and elimination of non-value added activities/processes AND though the training of Financial Affairs employees in the use of more efficient and effective project management techniques.

All goals include a list of action steps. For example the action steps of the first goal include:

a. Adoption of ten leadership behaviors by all Financial Affairs managers and supervisors.

b. Sensitivity and motivational training for managers and supervisors.

c. Vice President for Financial Affairs communication that change and major projects require

---

[3] As part of its continuous quality initiative, a process improvement team is in place in each major academic and administrative unit at Villanova University.

greater investment of time by all employees.

d. Provision for personal and professional development within budgetary limits.

e. Periodic visits by Vice President for Financial Affairs to all units to assess the quality commitment climate.

f. Managers and supervisors to conduct all meetings with unit personnel in accordance with VQI tools and spirit to promote dialogue and team work.

g. Development of recognition and incentive program that encourages quality initiatives and service.

**Progress in the Financial Affairs Unit**

While a great deal has been accomplished, much remains to be done. Progress is slow, but we have concluded that patience is the key to success. Following are brief descriptions of some of the action steps that have been successfully implemented.

1. Leadership behaviors are always discussed and illustrated at Financial Affairs Unit management meetings.

2. Updates on current quality improvement projects and initiatives are given at all Financial Affairs Unit management meetings.

3. The Vice President for Financial Affairs has begun to meet with non-management staff in all Financial Affairs sub-units on a rotating basis to discuss goals, solicit ideas and assess quality commitment climate.

4. Bulletin boards have been installed in all buildings where Financial Affairs Unit staff are located to enhance communication.

5. E-Mail linkage has been established to facilitate communications among all Financial Affairs Unit staff about what is happening within Financial Affairs Unit.

6. Community Forums are held once a year to reflect on past accomplishments, to plan for the future and to socialize.

7. Town meetings are held on an as needed basis to discuss important issues and share useful information.

8. Development of training programs for all Financial Affairs Unit staff in time management, team building, project management and quality improvement tools is under way.

9. Financial Affairs Unit has developed its own work process reengineering model to define, analyze, evaluate and modify work processes.

**Final Note**

The Villanova Climate Survey was a collaborative project that not only profiled the attitudes and perceptions of faculty and staff but also brought about significant impacts. In this sense the study is self-standing. However, the survey will be repeated in 1997, three years after the initial study, in order to gauge progress and stimulate continuous improvement.

## References

1. Cornesky, R. et al (1992). Implementing Total Quality Management in Higher Education, Magna Publications, Madison, WI

2. Khandwalla, P. N. (1977). The Design of Organizations, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., New York, NY

3. Mattice, N. J. (1995). Research Report: Survey of Faculty, Staff and Administrators, College of the Canyons, Santa Clarita, CA.

4. Mohammadi, J. et al (1995). Research Report: Climate Study, Patrick Henry Community College, Martinsville, VA.

5. Morgan, G.. (1986). Images of Organization, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA

6. Seymour, D. T. (1992). On Q: Causing Quality in Higher Education, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, NY

# Villanova University — Campus Climate Survey

**Definitions of Terms Used In This Survey**: For purposes of this survey, the term "Senior Leaders" refers to the President, Vice Presidents, Deans and Executive Directors. The term "Supervisor" refers to the person to whom you directly report. For the typical faculty member, this person is your Department Chair or Program Director. For Department Chairs, this person is your Dean. For staff members, this is the person to whom you directly report and can be anyone from an Assistant Supervisor to the President.

1. **What is your primary job function at the University?**
(● one) ..... Academic Administrator/Department Chair - 1 ○
Non-Academic Administrator/Supervisor - 2 ○
Faculty - 3 ○
Office Support Staff - 4 ○
Professional Staff (non-supervisory) - 5 ○
Service and Maintenance Staff - 6 ○
Specify: _____ .... Other - 7 ○

2. **What is your gender?** (● one) ..... Female - 1 ○
Male - 2 ○

3. **How long have you been employed by the University?**
(● one) ..... Less Than 5 Years - 1 ○
5 - 10 Years - 2 ○
More Than 10 Years - 3 ○

4. **What is your employment status?** (● one) ..... Full-Time - 1 ○
Part-Time - 2 ○

5. **In which area of the University do you work?** .... (● only one)

***Academic*** ..... ***OR*** ↗

- **College of Commerce and Finance** ..... 01 - ○
- **College of Engineering** ..... 02 - ○
- **College of Liberal Arts and Sciences** ..... 03 - ○
- **College of Nursing** ..... 04 - ○
- **Enrollment Management** (Enrollment Management, Financial Assistance, Registrar, Undergraduate Admission) ..... 05 - ○
- **Falvey Library** ..... 06 - ○
- **Law School** ..... 07 - ○
- **Vice President For Academic Affairs** (Continuing Education, Graduate School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Office of the VPAA, ORSP, University College, Other) ..... 08 - ○

***Administrative***

- **Administration** (Office of the VPA, Public Safety, Residence Hall Security, University Shop) ..... 09 - ○
- **Dining Services/Connelly Center** ..... 10 - ○
- **Facilities Management** (Custodial Services, Facilities Management, Grounds, Maintenance, Steam Plant) ..... 11 - ○
- **Financial Affairs** (Accounts Payable, Bursar, Controller, Graphic Services, Mail, Office of VPFA, Payroll, Personnel, Purchasing) ..... 12 - ○
- **Institutional Advancement** (Alumni Affairs, Development, Office of the VPIA, Public Relations) ..... 13 - ○
- **Office of the President** (Athletics, Campus Ministry, General Counsel, Multicultural Affairs, OPIR, University Senate) ..... 14 - ○
- **Student Life** (Alcohol/Drug Assistance, Career Planning/Placement, Counseling Center, Dean of Students, Health Center, Music Activities, Office of the VPSL, Residence Life, Student Development) ..... 15 - ○
- **UCIS** ..... 16 - ○

Using the scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree", please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. Because of the broad scope of this survey, you may find that certain items do not apply to you. If you do not feel the item applies to you, or if you are unsure or don't know how to rate a particular item, please mark the column labeled "Unsure/Not Applicable". Please be sure to ● one circle per statement.

| **COMMUNICATION** ..... (please ● one per statement) | **Strongly Disagree** ..... **Strongly Agree** | **Unsure/ Not Applicable** |
|---|---|---|
| 6. At the University, departments work well together to achieve common goals ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 7. Senior leaders effectively communicate the University's vision, goals and values to me ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 8. My supervisor effectively communicates our department's vision, goals and values to me ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 9. I understand the mission, goals and values of the University ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 10. I understand the mission, goals and values of my department ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 11. Open communication and information sharing are encouraged at the University ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 12. Open communication and information sharing are encouraged within my department ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 13. The University has formal ways for me to raise problems and suggestions for improvement ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 14. My supervisor communicates effectively with me ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 15. I am kept up-to-date on what is happening within my department ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 16. I am kept up-to-date on what is happening within the University ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 17. In general, I believe senior leaders of the University are open with information ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 18. In general, I believe senior leaders of the University are open about their plans ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 19. In general, I am satisfied with the level of communication within my department ..... | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| COMMUNICATION - Continued (please ● one per statement) | Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree | Unsure/ Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|
| 20. I am satisfied with the level of communication between my department and other departments | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 21. Overall, I am satisfied with my level of communication with senior leaders | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 22. During the past two years, communication has improved at the University | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 23. My department has clear goals for improving the quality of our work | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 24. I receive rapid responses from other departments when I make requests or ask questions | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 25. I receive accurate responses from other departments when I make requests or ask questions | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| **SATISFACTION** (please ● one per statement) | | |
| 26. My supervisor cares about my job satisfaction | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 27. My supervisor is understanding of my personal circumstances outside of my job | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 28. My salary is satisfactory | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 29. My benefits package is satisfactory | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 30. I would recommend my job to someone seeking meaningful work | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 31. My skills and abilities are being used effectively in my job | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 32. There are adequate opportunities for further developing my skills and abilities | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 33. My work area is suitable for my job requirements | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 34. With the exception of an occasional "bad day", I like my job | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 35. I believe my job is important | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 36. My supervisor believes my job is important | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 37. My work is interesting | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 38. My work is challenging | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 39. My work load is reasonable | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 40. The time pressures of my job are reasonable | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 41. I believe that I contribute an important service to the University | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 42. I am satisfied with the independence I have in my job | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 43. I feel accepted at the University | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 44. I feel appreciated at the University | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 45. I feel that my employment at the University is secure | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| **COLLEGIAL DECISION MAKING** (please ● one per statement) | | |
| 46. My department systematically collects information to improve work processes | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 47. Faculty input on major decisions is encouraged in my department | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 48. Staff input on major decisions is encouraged in my department | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 49. Senior leaders encourage faculty input on major decisions | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 50. Senior leaders encourage staff input on major decisions | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 51. My supervisor recognizes that there may be more than her/his way to do a job effectively | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 52. My department typically creates teams to solve problems | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 53. My department encourages prudent risk-taking | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 54. I have input into decision making within my department | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 55. My supervisor openly discusses with me the reasons for decisions which have already been made | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 56. My supervisor usually uses facts and data to make decisions | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 57. When my department makes a decision, it is usually based on analysis of facts and data | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 58. I had appropriate input into my department's recent strategic plan | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 59. I participate in developing plans for my department | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 60. My department is continuously assessing its effectiveness | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |
| 61. My department is continuously improving its effectiveness | 1○ 2○ 3○ 4○ 5○ 6○ | 9○ |


BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree | Unsure/ Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LEADERSHIP** (please ● one per statement) | | | | | | | |
| 62. I am encouraged to act independently and assume responsibility | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 63. Responsibility is delegated appropriately to me | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 64. I am held accountable for results | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 65. My supervisor is available when needed | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 66. Senior leaders make themselves accessible to me | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 67. Policies are applied consistently and fairly within my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 68. Policies are applied consistently and fairly within the University | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 69. My supervisor establishes clear vision and direction for my work | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 70. My director establishes clear vision and direction for my work | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 71. My supervisor provides me with helpful feedback about my job performance | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 72. My supervisor typically lets me know what is expected of me | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 73. My supervisor encourages change and innovation | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 74. Senior leaders encourage change and innovation | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 75. My supervisor has reasonable expectations for my job performance | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 76. My supervisor avoids favoritism | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 77. My supervisor typically delivers on promises made to me | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 78. My supervisor deals honestly with me | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 79. My supervisor gives consistent messages | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 80. Senior leaders understand the job-related needs of faculty | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 81. Senior leaders understand the job-related needs of staff | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| **TRUST AND RESPECT** (please ● one per statement) | | | | | | | |
| 82. Overall, there is trust and respect between senior leaders and faculty/staff at the University | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 83. Senior leaders seriously consider the ideas I present to them | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 84. I am comfortable making suggestions for improving my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 85. I am comfortable offering dissenting opinions in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 86. Faculty respect the staff in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 87. Faculty respect one another in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 88. Staff respect the faculty in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 89. Staff respect one another in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 90. Students respect the staff in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 91. Students respect the faculty in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 92. Faculty respect the students in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 93. Staff respect the students in my department | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 94. My supervisor trusts me | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 95. My supervisor respects me | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 96. I trust my supervisor | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 97. I respect my supervisor | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 98. The ideas I present to my supervisor are seriously considered | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| **RECOGNITION** (please ● one per statement) | | | | | | | |
| 99. My supervisor recognizes my job accomplishments | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 100. The University encourages my career development | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 101. The University recognizes and rewards people who stretch themselves to achieve difficult goals | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 102. My supervisor recognizes and rewards hard work as well as results | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 103. My co-workers recognize one another for jobs well done | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |
| 104. I recognize my co-workers for jobs well done | 1○ | 2○ | 3○ | 4○ | 5○ | 6○ | 9○ |

| SENSE OF COMMUNITY (please ● one per statement) | Strongly Disagree 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly Agree 6 | Unsure/ Not Applicable 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 105. The University community is responsive to social problems | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 106. The University community is responsive to environmental problems | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 107. People at the University care about one another | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 108. The University acts compassionately in issues related to rightsizing | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 109. Innovation and continuous improvement are encouraged at the University | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 110. Taking pride in my work is encouraged at the University | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 111. I believe that I am an important member of the University community | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 112. I take personal responsibility for contributing to the University's achievement of its goals | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 113. I take pride in the University | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 114. Employees are committed to the University | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

115. **What other comments would you like to make about Villanova University?**

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this important effort. With the enclosed self-addressed, postage-paid envelope, you may use either campus mail or the U.S. Postal Service to return your completed survey to:

**Office of Planning and Institutional Research**
Villanova University
800 Lancaster Avenue
Villanova, Pennsylvania 19085-1699

**Please return your completed survey within the next ten days - before you leave for the holidays.**